

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT, EASTERN DIVISION
AT: MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA**

GENE COGGINS
Plaintiff

v:

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3: 07CV 406-mef

TALLAPOOSA COUNTY
DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE
125 BROADNAX ST.
TALLAPOOSA COUNTY COURTHOUSE
DADEVILLE, AL 36853

TALLAPOOSA COUNTY
SHERIFF DEPARTMENT
101 N. BROADNAX ST.
DADEVILLE, AL 36853

Defendants

**THIS COMPLAINT IS FILED AGAINST THE
DEFENDANT, ABOVE THAT IS INVOLVED
IN DESTROYING MY CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS, AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN**

COMES NOW, THE PLAINTIFF, GENE COGGINS IN THE ABOVE STYLED
ACTION , AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS INVOLVED, WITH PROPER;

1. AUTHORITY,
2. SERVICE
3. WRIT OF CERTIORARI
4. JURISDICTION
5. COST OF ACTION
6. CAUSE OF ACTION
7. EVIDENCE OR FACTS
8. JUDGMENT,

9. CONCLUSION
10. AFFIDAVIT
11. MOTION TO APPEAR IN FORMA PAUPERIS
12. MOTION TO USE THE APPENDIX SYSTEM
13. MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE
14. SUMMONS TO PRODUCE RECORDS
15. SUMMONS FOR DEFENDANTS

01.

1. AUTHORITY:

I HAVE CHOSEN TO MANAGE MY OWN CASE AS GIVEN TO EVERY CITIZEN IN THE UNITED STATES, THAT EVERYONE HAS THE GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REPRESENT THEM SELF IN ANY CASE IN ANY COURT IN THIS LAND.. Code 1852, s/s 737, Code 1867, s/s 871, Code 1876, s/s 790, Code 1886, s/s 863, Code 1896, s/s 589, Code 1907, s/s 2981, Code 1923, s/s 6246, Code 1940, T. 46, s/s 41..

A STATE CANNOT EXCLUDE A PERSON FROM ~~THE~~ THE PRACTICE OF LAW OR FROM ANY OTHER OCCUPATION IN A MATTER OR FOR REASONS THAT CONTRAVENE THE DUE PROCESS OF OR EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.. 535, U. S. At 238 - 239, 77 S. CT. At 756..

THE PRINCIPAL AUTHORITY AS A REASONABLY PRUDENT MAN USING DILIGENCE AND DISCRETION PRINCIPALS USUALLY INCLUDES WHAT EVER IS NECESSARY IN CARRYING OUT AND PROTECTING THE DUE PROCESS OF LAW AS FOUND IN THE 5th AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AGAIN IN THE 14th AMENDMENT WHICH PROTECTS A PERSON FROM STATE ACTIONS WHERE THE PERSON IS GUARANTEED FAIR PROCEDURES AND SUBSTANTIVE UNDER SAFEGUARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS RIGHTS, AS ESTABLISHED IN OUR SYSTEM OF JURISPRUDENCE FOR THE ENFORCEMENT AND PROTECTION OF PRIVATE RIGHTS..

SERVICE:

THE EXHIBITION OR DELIVERY OF A SUMMONS, WRIT, COMPLAINT, NOTICE OR ORDER BY AN AUTHORIZED PERSON, TO A PERSON WHO IS HEREBY NOTIFIED WITH A REASONABLE NOTICE TO DEFENDANT OF PROCEEDINGS TO APPEAR AND BE HEARD, BY EITHER ACTUAL PERSONAL DELIVERY, BY MAIL OR CAUSING TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE NEWSPAPER, THAT HE MUST TAKE ACTION OR TO FORBEAR. IN DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT. Fed. R. Civil. P. 4, 5, Fed. R. Crim. P. 4, 49..Chemical Specialties Sales Corp. Industrial Div. V: Basic Inc. D.C. Conn. 296 F. Supp. 1106, 1107, Fed. R. Civil P. 4(e)..Must comply to the Fair Labor Standards Act..

A CIVIL SUMMONS IS ENCLOSED FOR EVERY DEFENDANT LISTED IN THIS COMPLAINT, WITH NO EXCEPTIONS, BY WAIVER, OR REMOVAL BY ANY ONE OTHER THAN THE PLAINTIFF. THE CLERK IS REQUIRED TO HAVE A COPY OF THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT, HAND DELIVERED TO THE LAST KNOWN ADDRESS OF THE ABOVE DEFENDANTS, BY ANY U. S. MARSHALL, WITH A COPY OF DATE DELIVERED, BY WHOM, RETURNED TO PLAINTIFF AND THE ORIGINAL TO THE CLERKS OFFICE. ANY VARIATIONS OF THIS REQUEST WILL BRING **FRAUD** AND **NEGLIGENCE** CHARGES AGAINST THE CLERKS OFFICE.. ALL SERVICES WILL BE MADE ACCORDING TO THE ABOVE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL P., ,. THEREFORE SERVICE CANNOT BE USED AS A MEANS OF DISMISSAL. **NEGLIGENCE** HAS ALREADY BEEN A PART OF THE CASE AGAINST MIKE COGGINS AND DIANNE HARRELSON. THEY WERE SERVED WITH A SUMMONS BY THE SHERIFF

DEPARTMENT AND NEVER ANSWERED THE COMPLAINT IN ANY FORM, WHEN I FILED A DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT AGAINST THEM, THE CLERK DID NOT ABIDE BY THE LAW GOVERNING THIS ACTION. THIS NEGLIGENCE AND INTENTIONAL FRAUD BY DECEIVING ANY UNFAIR ACT, CHEATING, CUNNING, WITH INTENTIONS OF DECEIVING ANOTHER BY NOT ACTING UPON, BY THE CONCEALMENT OF THE TRUTH TO HIS LEGAL RIGHTS, WHERE THE CLERK IS REQUIRED TO ENTER DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IS COVERED IN FEDERAL RULE 55. ALL OF THIS DENIAL AND NEVER ACTED UPON BY THE CLERK MAKES THIS WRONGFUL ACT OF OMISSION EMBRACES THE DISHONESTY CARRIED OUT BY THE CLERK. Greco V: Kresge Co. 277, N. Y. 26, 12, N. E. 2d, 557, 562.. Hilbert V: Canning 58, Ariz. 290, 119, P. 2d, 233, 236..

WRIT OF CERTIORARI:

A PRECEPT IN WRITING USUALLY IN THE FORM OF A LETTER THAT REQUIRES A DESIRE TO COMMAND, EITHER AS THE COMMENCEMENT OF A LAW SUIT OR OTHER PROCEEDINGS, REQUIRING THE PERFORMANCE OF A SPECIFIED ACT GIVING AUTHORITY TO HAVE IT DONE EITHER AS THE COMMENCE OF A SUIT, OR OTHER REQUIRED ACTS. THE WORD WRIT HAS MANY VARIOUS NAMES AND DESCRIPTIONS, ONE REFERS TO A FEDERAL ACT WHICH PERMITS FEDERAL APPELLATE COURTS TO ISSUE ALL WRITS NECESSARY OR APPROPRIATE IN AID OF OR TO THEIR RESPECTIVE JURISDICTION AND AGREEABLE TO THE USAGE AND PRINCIPLES OF LAW. 28 U. S. C. A. s/s1651.. THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI AS GIVEN IN THE NON-CRIMINAL ACT , 11Cir. R. ADDENDUM FIVE..

JURISDICTION:

WHERE THERE IS A CONSTITUTION RIGHT OR QUESTION INVOLVED IN A CASE, THEN THIS AUTOMATIC BECOMES AS ISSUE THAT MUST BE SETTLED IN FEDERAL COURT, WHERE EVER JURISDICTIONS REQUIREMENTS ARE MET. THE LEGAL RIGHT EXIST WHEN THE COURT HAS COGNIZANCE OF CLASS OF CASES, INVOLVING PROPER PARTIES ARE PRESENT AND POINT TO BE DECIDED IS WITHIN THE POWER OF THE COURT. *United Cemeteries Co. V: Strother*, 342 Mo. 1155, 119, S. W. 2d, 762, 765.. *Harder V: Johnson*, 147 Kan. 440, 76 P. 2d, 763, 764.. JURISDICTION AMOUNT INVOLVED IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE; *Shabotzby V: Mas. Mut. Ins. Co. D. C. N. Y.* 21 F. Supp. 166, 167. VALUE OF THE OBJECT SOUGHT TO BE ATTAINED IN THIS CASE, *Mountain State Power Co. V: City of Forsyth*, D. C. Mont. 41 Supp. 389, 390. *Ronzio V: Denver & R. G. W. R. Co. C. C.A. Utah* 116 F. 2d, 604, 606.. AS LIMITED TO THE TOTAL MONETARY VALUE OF SUCH ACTION,. Fed. R. 28, U. S. C. A. s/s s/s 1331, 1332... THE LEGAL POWERS OF THIS COURT TO RENDER A JUST DECISION AND PERSONAL JUDGMENT AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS , IN THIS ACTION OR PROCEEDINGS ARE FOUND IN; *Imperial V: Hardy La.* 302, So. 2d, 05, 07.. . THE SCOPE AND EXTENT OF JURISDICTION FOR FEDERAL COURTS IS GOVERNED BY, 28 U. S. C. A. s/s 1251, et seq. WHERE JURISDICTION IS THE POWER INTRODUCED FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD, OR FOR THE ACCOUNT OF DISPENSING FAIR JUSTICE TO ALL CITIZENS JURISDICTION IS NOT LIMITED TO SUBJECT MATTER, OR AMOUNT SOUGHT IN THE LITIGATION, BUT FACTS MUST EXIST FOR THE FEDERAL COURT TO HAVE PROPER JURISDICTION ON ANY PARTICULAR CASE;

1. IS THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN PROPERLY SERVED WITH ON GOING PROCESS,
2. THAT THE CONTROVERSY EXCEEDS A CERTAIN SUM,
3. THAT THE PARTIES ARE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.. Nobel V: Union River Logging Railroad Co. 147 U. S. 165, 13, S. Ct. 271, 37, L. Ed. 123.. ALL OF THE ABOVE QUALIFICATIONS FOR PROPER JURISDICTION ARE MET, ACCORDING TO THE ABOVE EXAMPLES, THE EVIDENCE INVOLVED, REQUIRING THE CLERK INVOLVED, TO PRODUCE, THE PAPERWORK INVOLVED IN THIS CASE BY MEANS OF A SUMMONS...

COST OF ACTION;

THE LEGAL TERM FOR COST OF ACTION IS COVERED UNDER MY GUARANTEED RIGHT BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, TO EVERY CITIZEN HAS THE RIGHT TO APPEAR IN FORMA PAUPERIS AS FOUND IN FED. R. APP. P. 39, WITH NO FEES, COST, OR GIVEN SECURITY IN ANY FORM, THEREFORE ADDED ON. FED. R. 28 - 38, U. S. C. MAY V; WILLIAMS 17 AL. 23 (1849).. THIS DECISION CANNOT BE MADE BY ANY JUDGE OR CLERK FOR THIS IS A GIVEN LAW, GOVERN THIS ACTION....

CAUSE OF ACTION:

THIS BEGIN WHEN WITH MY GUARANTEED CONSTITUTION RIGHTS FOR A SPEEDY TRIAL, AS GIVEN IN THE FEDERAL ACT OF 1974, SET OUT AND ESTABLISHED TIME LIMITS ON ANY EVENTS THAT ARE CARRIED OUT IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM AS SO PLACED ON THE SHORT TERM CALENDER SO AS TO

ASSURE A SPEEDY TRIAL. THE 7th AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION REQUIRES A TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY, EITHER CIVIL OR CRIMINAL ON ALL ISSUES BETWEEN THE PARTIES, WHETHER THEY BE ISSUES OF LAW OR FACTS WITH NO RESTRAINTS OR ILLEGAL COST ADDED ON, BEFORE A COURT THAT HAS PROPER JURISDICTION.. Fed. R. Civil P. 38(a), 48, Crim. P. 23, 33, Fed. R. Civil P. 59

AFTER ABOUT TWO YEARS OF DOING NOTHING, IN THE PROBATE OFFICE ABOUT SETTLING MOTHERS WILL, I APPEALED THIS TO THE CIRCUIT COURT IN TALLAPOOSA COUNTY, SEVERAL MONTHS LATER I RECEIVED A NOTICE THAT THIS APPEAL WAS DENIED FOR NOT PAYING COST OF APPEAL TO CLERK. HERE AGAIN BY GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT HAS BEEN VIOLATED, MY RIGHT TO APPEAL ANY AND ALL DECISIONS MADE IN A LOWER COURT WITHOUT ANY FORM OF FEES, COST, BOND, OR GIVING ANY FORM OF SECURITY, ADD3ED ON, NO RESTRAINTS, OR ILLEGAL COST. FED. R. APP. 28-38, FED R. CIVIL P. 48 Crim. P. 23 - 33, FED. r. CIVIL P. 59...

LOOK AT THE TIMES I MADE REPORTS TO THE SHERIFF OFFICE ABOUT THE ILLEGAL BREAK IN, STEALING, AND DAMAGING TO MY HOUSE AND PROPERTY. THAT MY NEPHEW (MIKE COGGINS), WAS MAKING, THEY NEVER MADE ANY EFFORT TO STOP HIM. NO INVESTIGATIONS WERE MADE AS TO THE PROPERTY OWNER (BY TRUE DEED), OR ANY OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENT. AFTER TRYING TO HAVE THE SHERIFF OFFICE TO STOP THIS ILLEGAL DAMAGE (DOZENS OF TIMES), BEING DONE TO MY HOUSE, I TOLD HIM MANY TIMES TO

STAY OFF OF THIS PROPERTY, WITH NO RESULTS. AFTER MIKE REMOVED THE OUTSIDE DOORS AND STOLE MANY THINGS FROM THE HOUSE ONE THURSDAY, I WENT BY THE SHERIFF OFFICE TO MAKE ANOTHER REPORT AND TRIED TO SWEAR OUT A WARRANT, AGAIN WITH NO RESULTS. BEFORE LEAVING THE SHERIFF CAME OUT AND TOLD ME THAT JACKSON'S GAP POLICE HAD AN WARRANT OUT FOR MY ARREST. I WAS PLACED IN JAIL AND ABOUT TWO HOURS LATER THE JACKSON'S GAP POLICE OFFICER CAME IN AND MADE OUT A WARRANT AGAINST ME FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND MENACING. HERE AGAIN MY GUARANTEED CONSTITUTION RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED. IN AMENDMENT #5 NO PERSON SHALL BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR A CAPITAL, OR OTHER WISE ANY OTHER INFAMOUS CRIME UNLESS AN INDICTMENT BY A GRAND JURY. NO CITY, COUNTY OR STATE CAN CHANGE THIS OR CREATE THEIR OWN METHODS, LIKE ABOVE BY PLACING IN JAIL FIRST BEFORE THE WARRANT HAS BEEN SERVED, HOLDING ANYONE FOR TWELVE HOURS. BEFORE AN INDICTMENT HAS BEEN HANDED DOWN. WHERE THERE ARE UNEDUCATED PEOPLE IN PUBLIC OFFICE, MAKING THIS KIND OF ILLEGAL ARREST AND CHARGES AGAINST PROPERTY OWNERS THAT HAVE HAD A TRUE DEED, TRYING TO DEFEND THEIR OWN PROPERTY, BORN AND LIVED IN THIS COUNTY AND STATE, THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE EXPLORATION AS TO WHY .. THE SHERIFF OFFICE CHOOSES TO SUPPORT A LIFE TIME CRIMINAL, DRUG PUSHER, DOPE ADDICT, THAT STEALS AND DESTROYES EVERY THING HE CAN TO SUPPORT HIM AND HIS HABITS. BY NOT SERVING AN ARREST WARRENT AGAINST HIM, INDICATES THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL NEEDS TO BE NOTIFIED OF

THIS RELATIONSHIP, BETWEEN THESE. AGAIN THE JACKSON'S GAP POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THE TALLAPOOSA COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE DENIES ANY ONE ANY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN THIS COUNTY, AMENDMENT NUMBER 4., STATES THAT PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE SECURE IN THEIR OWN HOUSES, PAPERS, AND OTHER EFFECTS, AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES, SHALL NOT BE VIOLATED AND **NO WARRANT SHALL BE ISSUED**, BUT UPON PROBABLE CAUSE. WHEN I HAD A WARRANT SWORN OUT FOR HIM FOR STEALING AND DAMAGING MY PROPERTY AT THE CLERKS OFFICE, THEY REFUSED TO SETTLE. WHEN I ASKED FOR A COPY OF WHAT SUPPOSED TO BE PUBLIC RECORDS, I WAS DENIED THIS REQUIRES AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE TO BE ISSUED AGAINST THE CLERKS OFFICE...

THIS HAS BECOME A REGULAR THING WITH THE ABOVE DEFENDANTS. THEY DON'T BELIEVE IN GUARANTEED CONSTITUTION RIGHTS, OR ANY FEDERAL LAW THAT MAY APPLY TO THEM. THEY HAVE THE ATTITUDE PROBLEM THAT THEY CAN DO NO WRONG AND THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO DECIDE WHAT CONSTITUTION OR FEDERAL LAWS THEY WANT TO APPLY TO WHOM THEY CHOOSE.

EVIDENCE OR FACTS:

ALL EVIDENCE CAN BE FOUND IN THE PAPER WORK FILED IN COURT AGAINST ME, STARTING WITH CASE NO. CV - 05 - 077, FOLLOWING WITH THE APPEALS TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT. I THEREFORE REQUIRE A SUMMONS TO ALL CLERKS INVOLVED FROM THE BEGINNING OF THIS CASE UNTIL FINAL TO PRODUCE A COPY OF ALL RECORDS INVOLVED AGAINST ME,

JUDGMENT:

1. A FINE OF ONE MILLION DOLLARS FOR EVERY DEFENDANT, FOR DESTROYING MY GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
2. FOR FRAUD AND NEGLIGENCE CHARGES , ONR MILLION DOLLARS, PER DEF..
3. FOR ALLOWING MIKE COGGINS TO STORE HIS JUNK IN MY HOUSE AND ON MY PROPERTY, A FINE OF **TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS PER DAY**, FROM DAY OF SERVICE, UNTIL REMOVED.
4. FOR CONVERGING, AND PROTECTING A DRUG ADDICT AND THIEF, (MIKE COGGINS), NOT PROVIDING PROTECTION TO PROPERTY OWNER, A FINE OF FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS,, PER DEFENDANT.
- 5.. FOR MAKING ILLEGAL ARREST AND TIME SPENT IN JAIL, ARRESTED BEFORE WARRANT WAS SERVED, DENYING MY DUE PROCESS OF LAW, NOT ABIDING BY THE RESTRAINING ORDER, A FINE OF ONE MILLION DOLLARS..
6. IF ANY ADDITION APPEALS HAVE TO BE MADE THE TOTAL JUDGMENT IS TO TRIPLE, FOR EVER APPEAL..
7. IF ANY ONE INVOLVED IN THIS CASE LIKE SHERIFF, INVESTIGATORS, OR CLERK FAILS TO CARRY OUT THEIR REQUIRED DUTY, A FINE OF TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS PER DAY MUST BE ADDED.
8. FOR NOT IN FORCING THE PERMANENT RESTRAINING ORDER THAT WENT INTO EFFECT AFTER MIKE FAILED TO ANSWER THE COMPLAINT AND DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT WAS FILED AGAINST HIM.. UNDER ALABAMA LAW, AS LISTED ON THE SUMMONS, EVERY THING ASKED FOR IN

THE COMPLAINT MUST BE GRANTED, A FINE OF TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS PER DAY. FROM SERVICE, UNTIL FINAL..


9. FOR NOT SERVING WARRANTS ON MIKE COGGINS, FOR THE STEALING AND DESTRUCTION ON MY PROPERTY, ABOUT 15 TIMES THIS WAS REPORTED WITH NO RESULTS, THEREFORE AN ADDITIONAL THREE MILLION DOLLARS WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE FINE. AGAIN DENYING MY DUE PROCESS OF LAW .
10. A SECURITY BOND MUST BE POSTED FOR ALL DEFENDANTS, THREE TIMES THE AMOUNT OF THE REQUESTED JUDGMENT MADE PAYABLE TO THE PLAINTIFF, IF FINAL SETTLEMENT IS NOT MADE WITHIN THIRTY DAYS FROM SERVICE..

THE SAME JUDGMENT, WITH ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE, APPLIES TO THE CIRCUIT CLERK, FRANK LUCKUS, FOR NOT ABIDING BY THE LAW GOVERNING FILING DEFAULT , AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT. AFTER ALL DEFENDANTS ARE PROPERLY SERVED AND FAIL TO PLEAD, ANSWER, OR OTHER WISE, DEFEND, THEY ARE IN DEFAULT, WHEN A MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT IS ENTERED AGAINST THEM BY THE PLAINTIFF, THE CLERK IS ORDERED TO ENTER THIS AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS AND WHAT EVER IS DEMANDED IN THE COMPLAINT MUST BE GRANTED. FED. RULE 55. ALL OF THIS WAS NEVER ACTED UPON BY THE CLERK. THIS IS A GIVEN LAW NOT TO BE DENIED BY ANY COURT, THIS WRONGFUL ACT OF OMISSION EMBRACES THE DISHONESTY CARRIED OUT BY THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK. Greco V: S. S. Kresge

Co. 2777, N. Y. 26, 12, N. E. 2d, 557, 562. Hilkert V: Canning 58 Ariz. 290, 119, P 2d, 233, 236.. THE CLERK ONLY ROLL IN A CASE IS TO FILE AND KEEP THE PAPER WORK, AS REQUIRED BY LAW FOR THE COURT AS EVERY CASE REQUIRES.

CONCLUSION:

LOOKING AT THE LAST CASE I APPEALED TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, EVERY ILLEGAL EXCUSE WAS USED TO AVOID THE SETTLEMENT OF THIS CASE. THIS MUST BE HEARD BY AN IMPARTIAL FEDERAL JUDGE THAT IS NOT IN BEDDED, INFLUENCED BY THE ALABAMA BAR ASSOCIATION, CORRUPT LAWYERS FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE, NO MAGISTRATE JUDGE CAN BE INVOLVED BY LAW, THEY CAN BE APPOINTED ONLY IN MINOR OFFENSES BY THE FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE, AND THIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT VIOLATION IS NOT A MINOR OFFENSE. IF THE FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE FEELS LIKE HE CANNOT ISSUE A FAIR AND JUST DECISION BASED UPON THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED, THEN HE MUST RETIRE FROM THIS CASE AND LET AT LEAST THREE JUDGES DETERMINE THE SETTLEMENT, NEEDED TO FINALIZE THIS CASE. ..



GENE COGGINS Pro st.
1436 COUNTY RD. #299
LANETT, AL 36863
(334) 576 - 3263

cc:
UNITED STATES
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

INVOLVED CASES:

1. CV - 05 - 077 NOVEMBER 08, 2005 CHAMBERS COUNTY, LANETT, AL
2. CV - 05 - 077 NOVEMBER 17, 2006 CHAMBERS COUNTY
3. 3:06 CV 1112 - MEF APPEAL U.S. DISTRICT COURT MONT, AL.
4. 2005 - 0084 TALLAPOOSA COUNTY DADEVILLE
5. 168574 CHAMBERS COUNTY .
6. 3:04 - CV - 506 - M TALLAPOOSA COUNTY
7. 06 - 00687 CV - 3 - WHA - DRB - 0 DISTRICT COURT MONT.
8. 06 -16194 - B APPEAL COURT ATLANTA, GA
9. INC. 04 - 400 MONTGOMERY, AL
10. INC. 05 - 1243 MONTGOMERY, AL
11. CV - 04 - 94 TALLAPOOSA COUNTY
12. MC - 07 - 03 TALLAPOOSA COUNTY